

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-11, 14, 15 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakajima (U.S. 6,325,287)

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16, and 17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

According to the forgoing, the claims are amended, and thus, the pending claims remain for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested. No new matter has been added.

REJECTION

The independent claims are 1, 10 and 19, which are anticipatorily rejected over Nakajima. The independent claims 1, 10 and 19 are amended for clarity so the language of the claims provides "detecting a plurality of regions of blocks block-regions corresponding to a respective plurality of two-dimensional codes, each block-region of blocks comprising a number of neighboring and contiguous blocks."

The Office Action relies on Nakajima column 9, lines 8-63 and FIG. 3 to meet the present claimed features "***detecting a plurality of regions of blocks*** block-regions ***corresponding to a respective plurality of two-dimensional codes, each block-region of blocks comprising a number of neighboring and contiguous blocks*** from among said detected blocks that satisfy specific conditions from said scanned blocks" and "***detecting one or more regions of two-dimensional code-regions***, each region of a two-dimensional code containing a corresponding detected region of blocks block-region comprising a predetermined number of the neighboring and contiguous blocks as a two-dimensional code." However, when Nakajima is specifically applied to the language of independent claims 1, 10 and 19, using claim 1 as an example, a *prima facie* case of anticipation cannot be established, since Nakajima column 9, line 8-21 and FIG. 13A, S3, S4, discuss labeling "black pixel contiguous regions" and determining if a total number of M black pixel contiguous regions is at least 257 or greater, which relate to pixel detection and a block detection, but fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently (fails to

necessarily include), the claimed features, for example, “detecting a plurality of regions of blocks block-regions ... each block-region of blocks comprising a number of neighboring and contiguous blocks” and “detecting one or more regions of two-dimensional code regions codes, each region of a two-dimensional code containing a corresponding detected region of blocks block-region.”

In other words, the present claimed “a square block unit of MXN pixels” can correspond to Nakajima’s “black pixel continuous region,” or a Nakajima white pixel continuous region, because Nakajima FIG. 13A discusses detecting continuous white or black pixels that can constitute one block of white or black pixels as one block of a two-dimensional code. Nakajima column 9, lines 8-10 expressly discusses “In step S3, as shown in FIG. 15, the CPU 52 successively numbers (labels), from top left to bottom right, regions [1, 2, 3, …] each composed of continuous black pixels.” Nakajima FIG. 11 expressly shows a region of 3 white blocks (column 7, lines 55-56). Also, Nakajima FIG. 17 expressly shows one black pixel contiguous region as one block of a two-dimensional code. Therefore, Nakajima FIGS. 13A and FIG. 15 black pixel contiguous regions 1, 2, 3 cannot anticipate the language of independent claims 1, 10 and 19 by failing to disclose expressly or inherently the claimed “detecting a plurality of regions of blocks block-regions corresponding to a respective plurality of two-dimensional codes, each block-region of blocks comprising a number of neighboring and contiguous blocks” from among said detected blocks that satisfy specific conditions from said scanned blocks” and “detecting one or more regions of two-dimensional code regions codes, each region of a two-dimensional code containing a corresponding detected region of blocks block-region comprising a predetermined number of the neighboring and contiguous blocks as a two-dimensional code.”

Further, Nakajima column 15, lines 46-55 discuss detection of a plurality of two-dimensional codes, but fails to disclose, either expressly or inherently, a two-dimensional code detection according to the language of the claims, for example, “detecting one or more regions of two-dimensional code regions codes, each region of a two-dimensional code containing a corresponding detected region of blocks block-region,” because Nakajima only detects a plurality of two-dimensional codes based upon detecting corresponding blocks of pixels, which differs from the claimed detection based upon “regions,” for example, “detecting ... regions of two-dimensional code regions codes, each region of a two-dimensional code

containing a corresponding detected region of blocks block-region." More particularly, the present Application FIG. 10 (square C) and FIG. 12 (outermost square), illustrate examples of the claimed present invention's "***detecting one or more regions of two-dimensional code regions codes, each region of a two-dimensional code containing a corresponding detected region of blocks***" block-region comprising a predetermined number of the neighboring and contiguous blocks as a two-dimensional code," and one benefit is even if the two-dimensional code is at an angle, the region containing the entire two-dimensional code can still be detected (paragraph 101 and FIGS. 10 and 12 of the present Application). Support for the claim amendments can be found, for example, in FIGS. 3, 9-12 (in particular FIGS. 7, 10, and 12A) and paragraphs 91-100 of the present Application, as the first and second embodiments.

In view of the remarks and claim amendments, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 24, 2007

By: 
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501